



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTE.

THE LATIN GERUNDIVE *-ndo-*.¹

This formation is explained in the handbooks before me as follows: 1st, as indirectly, that is to say, by an unusual phonetic, connected with the Greek suffix *-μενο-*. Accordingly it is assumed that the original meaning of the future participle of obligation is that of a simple passive participle (cf. V. Henry, *Gr. Comp.*, §137).

2d. Brugmann, in his *Vergl. Gram.* II, §69, equates *-ndo-* with a suffix *-tno-* after vowels (A. J. P. VIII 441-7). This was based on the use of the same suffix in Lithuanian as a participle of necessity.

3d. Brugmann abandons this view in §1103 and makes the form an infinitive in *-m* (accusative) plus a postposition *do* ('to').

The objections to the first view lie in the defective phonetic, and a strained sematology. Brugmann abandons the second view because there is nothing necessarily Aryan in the Lithuanian suffix *-tinās*. The third view is based on the assumption that the formation is specifically Latin, and must fall to the ground as soon as an Aryan connection is made good.

This I now attempt to do. I begin by insisting on the syntactical relation of the gerund and gerundive—a dat. gerund+acc. object may become a dative of both gerundive and governed noun. Now this phenomenon meets us in the Sanskrit dative infinitives, that the object noun is attracted into the dative case. Such a marked correspondence ought not to be accidental.

What is the infinitive in *°dhyāi*? Brugmann (§1088, 9; 1089, 12), following Bartholomae, explains *°dhyāi* as a dative to a noun from the root **dhē*, whose weakest stage is *dh-*. Accordingly the form *ἑλιδεσ-θαι* is explained as an acc. (loc.?) of the root-noun **ἑλιδεσ*+a root-infinitive **dhāi* = 'for putting,' ∴ = 'for putting into knowledge.' The subsequent division *ἑλιδε-σθαι* was a very natural popular etymology.

¹Professor FAY's note on the Gerundive was written in January last, and came into the Editor's hands only two or three days after Mr. HORTON-SMITH'S essay on the same subject had been sent to the printer. It is needless to emphasize the interest of the coincidences and differences of the simultaneous research along the same lines.—B. L. G.

With the details of this explanation I do not entirely agree, though accepting its substance. We should expect in Greek $^{\circ}\theta\alpha\iota$, not $^{\circ}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. This confusion crept in from 2d sg. act. $^{\circ}\sigma\theta\alpha$, by which 2d plur. $^{\circ}\sigma\theta\epsilon$ was affected, for the distinction of number breaks down entirely in the 2d person. It is possible that $-\sigma\theta-$ || $-\theta-$ crept in with the 1st plural $-\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ for $-\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, by a popular interpretation of $\mu\epsilon + \sigma\theta\alpha$ 'I and thou.' (Cf. the summary of my Studies in Agglutination in Proc. Am. Or. Soc. 1894.)

In this explanation we must observe that Grk. $^{\circ}\theta\alpha\iota$ does not equal Sk. $^{\circ}dhyāi$, a dative from a feminine stem in $dh-\bar{i}$ according to my explanation, but equals an Aryan $*dhāi$, a dative to a fem. in $-\bar{a}$, Sk. $*dhā$. So we have in the root-noun $jā-$ a dative (fem.) $jē$, but an infinitive-dative ($prati-$) $māi$, ($parā-$) $dāi$. An infinitive $*dhāi$ is every way justified. To a typical infinitive $yājadhyaī$ we can assume (as must be assumed for the Greek infinitive above) a by-form $*yajadhāi$.

It was seen in $Fēideσ-θ\alpha\iota$ that we have a locative, or at any rate some terminal case in composition with $^{\circ}dhāi$. Now $*yajadhāi$ may be a similar syntactical formation. Suppose we restore an Aryan $*yajndhāi$ from $yājen dhāi$, a suffixless locative from an $-en$ -stem? Now this corresponds precisely with a Latin type *legendae*, e. g. Sk. $*bharadhāi = ferendae$; the form $bhāradhyaī$ is in actual existence. The assumption of this locative to a stem in $-en$ is most easy: Sanskrit uses datives from *man-* and *van-* stems as infinitives, and so does Greek; cf. the stock examples *vidmāne* : $Fīδμεναι$, *dāvāne* : $δῶFεναι$. Greek further shows forms in simple $-en$ -stems, e. g. $ἄρχεν$ and other Doric forms (cf. Boisacq, *Les Dialectes Doriens*, p. 201). Whitney explains the Sk. infinitives in $-sani$ as locatives of $-en$ -stems to roots increased by $-s-$. Brugmann suggests that Grk. imperatives in $-ον-$, e. g. Syrak $λάβον$, Att. $δείξον$ are infinitives. We can explain the Att.-Ionic pres. infin. $φέρειν$ as from $*φερεσει = Sk. bhārāse$ (Wh., Gr.² 973 a), whence $*φερρηι$; and by association with $φέρειν$, made the easier by the paragogic $ν$, we reach $*φερην$ and $φέρειν$. According to this line of argument we must restore Sk. $bhāradhyaī$ from $*bherndhyaī$ and Lat. *ferendae* from $*bherndhāi$.

There is no reason, however, why we should not regard this form in $-en-$ as an acc. to a root-noun, and this seems to me the better explanation.

The accentual conditions of the Aryan form seem not to have been fixed. We have in Sk. $bhāradhyaī$ a strong stem

and the accent on the root. In Latin *ferundus* from **ferondus* we have the *e* and *o* grades in the position they would take most naturally in a rigid gradation, such as I have indicated for the perfects in my article in Am. Jour. of Philol. XIII 479. We also have Sanskrit types with weak roots and penultimate accents, e. g. *huvádhyāi*, where in a perfect gradation we ought to expect **huvándhyāi*. We have also strong roots with penultimate accent, e. g. *tarádhyāi*. We should expect for *tarádhyāi* an accentuation **tarádhyaī*, representing an Indo-European **torṇ-dhyāi*. Now remembering that we have set up an origin out of a syntactical combination for this infinitive, we may reconstruct a combination **spáçan dh(y)āi* = 'for putting in vision (i. e. seeing)' (cf. *tákṣ-an-*, Brug., Verg. Gr. II, §114), where each word has its own accent; in **ukṣán dhyāi*, however, after the combination became inseparable the accentuation might naturally become **ukṣándhyāi*; **táksṇ dhyāi*, on the other hand, gave **táksa-dhyāi*, and these types remained after **ukṣándhyāi* had become **ukṣádhyaī* to correspond with *táksadhyāi*.

A trace of the double accentuation may still be found, perhaps, in Sanskrit. At a time when they still said **táksṇ dhyāi*, and very possibly **táksṇ dhé* from **dhāi* (cf. supra), the infinitive *étave* acquired an analogical by-form *étavāi*, fashioned after **táksṇ dhyāi* and endowed, like it, with two accents; now when **táksṇ dhyāi* was later affected by **ukṣándhyai*, as assumed above, *étavāi* retained its analogical accent after its prototype had lost the same. No other explanation so well accounts for the puzzling double accent.

Lat. *ferendae* may represent an Indo-European **bhérṇdhai*, Sk. *bháradh(y)āi*, or a possible accentuation **bharṇdhāi*, a type of formation testified to by Avestan, and possibly by Greek. In Sanskrit the infinitive always appears as *-a-dhyāi*. In Avestan *-dyāi* is generally added directly to the root (Kanga, Avest. Gram., §566); sometimes the termination is *-a-dyāi*, as in Sk., used sometimes with a tense-stem, giving *-a-* the appearance of being a thematic vowel. This is also true in Sanskrit (Wh.², §976). Bartholomae (Alt-ir. Dial., §352) cites the form *ver'ndyāi*, in which he ascribes the *n* to the *nā*-class present stem. With this we must compare Vedic *pr'nádhyāi* : $\sqrt{pr} < n >$. We see that the formations are not identical. We ought instead to compare *ver'n-d-yāi* with Lat. *volen-d-i*.

In Greek also traces of this formation are to be found. The form *πεφάνθαι* (Plato) is too late to claim for primitive type, though if we put Vedic *vānṛdhādhyāi* beside it we might ascribe it to a primitive **be-bhṇ-n-dhāi*. We may, however, give a typical character to *Μελανθεύς* || *Μελάνθιος*, *Μελανθώ*, son and daughter of *Δολίος* (ρ 212, σ 322). I define by 'servitor': *μελω* 'care for,' and compare Lat. *mereo* 'serve.' In Greek there is variation between ρ and λ—*μέριμνα*: *μελέδημα* 'anxiety.' *Μελανθεύς* was a sort of general-purpose servant—a goat-herd by profession (11 times), he acts as butler (υ 255) and fire-maker (φ 176, 181). The notion that *Μελανθεύς* was by origin a common rather than a proper name finds support in its double form, -*θείς* being, as it were, an individualization of -*θιος*, and in its having a feminine -*θώ*.

This argument becomes stronger when we consider the name of the father *Δολίος*,¹ who was a *δμῶς* ('domestic') Penelope had brought from her father's (δ 736); his sons got ready the meal in ω 412 (cf. Lat. *merenda* 'meal').

In the -*ανθ-* of *Μελανθεύς* I see an -*ṇ-* + *dh-*, and explain -*αν-* (for -*α-*, i. e. *a*, from *ṇ*) as due to the conservatism of proper names (cf. Class. Rev. VII, p. 61).

In -*θιος* the kinship with -*dhyāi* || -*dhiyāi* is patent.

In accordance with the above explanation the aor. infin. in -*α<σ>θαι* might be explained for *ṇ+<σ>dh-*. This would lighten the rather overweighted analogical explanation of the σ-aorist in Greek. Only 1st sg. *σα* is strictly phonetic, for 3d plur. -*σαν* should be -*σα(τ)*.²

I have sought to justify phonetically the equation Latin *fer-en-d-ae* = Sk. *bhār-a-dh-yāi*; cf. Grk. *φέρε<σ>θ-αι*. I end with a comparison of the syntax of *ferendae* and *bhāradhyāi*.

It must be noted that Sanskrit does not always attract the acc. object of the infinitive into the dative: *tvāṁ sīṁ vṛshann akṛṇor duṣṭārītu sāho vīgvasmāi sāhase sāhadhyāi* (RV. 6. 1. 1) = 'Thou

¹ *Δολίος* 'tricksy' is a form parallel to *δοῦλος* 'slavish,' from a stem *doiyo-* || *doiyo-*, a relation seen in *ἄλλος*: Lat. *alius*. The meaning 'slave' for *δοῦλος* was got by contrast to *ἐλεύθερος* 'outspoken, frank, free' (cf. Aesch. Pers. 593 *ἐλευθερά βάζειν* with *δόλια ἔπεα*, ι 282); *κητήρα*—*ἐλεύθερον*, Z 528, has back of it somewhere the notion *in vino veritas*, and *ἐλευθερον ἦμαρ*, Z 455, compared with *δούλιον ἦμαρ*, ξ 340, lets us suppose a contrast of *ἐλεύθερα ἔπεα* with *δόλια ἔπεα* 'frank' opposed to 'guarded' ('tricksy') speech.

² In my Studies in Agglutination (supra l. c.) I explain the -*σα-* aor. as a feminine verb-form.

showest, hero, unsurpassable might for overcoming every force.' Cf. Sall.: *Lepidus arma cepit libertatis subvertendae* 'Lepidus took up arms to overthrow liberty'; *dviṣās tarādhyā ṛnayā na iyase* (RV. 9. 110. 1) = 'As an avenger dost thou come to conquer our enemies'; *iusiurandum rei servandae, non perdundae conditumst* (Plaut. Rud. 1374) 'the oath was seasoned to preserve and not destroy my stuff.' In the last Latin example *rei* may be a dative, and not a genitive; the first example shows that the genitive of characteristic, along with the indistinguishable gen. and dat. forms of 1st and 5th declensions, had shifted the Latin conception from a dative to a genitive. In the grammars I have at hand I find among the examples for this construction 16 feminines to 7 masculines, and register in the feminines 9 first- and fifth-declension nouns to 5 of other declensions. Sanskrit and Latin furnish similar examples for the construction with nouns or adjectives, e. g. *dādhṛvir bhāradhyāi* = 'capable of bearing'; *referundae ego habeo linguam natam grātia* (Plaut.) 'I have a tongue was born (is fit) for showing gratitude.'

Touching the active and passive meanings of the Latin gerundive: if we assume for *bhāradhyāi* an original sense = 'for putting into bearing,' it passed at once into the notion 'for bearing.' Now if we say *natus est grātia referundae*, we might also say **grātia [nobis] referundae est* = 'gratitude is [for us] for bearing,' passing at once into 'we must show gratitude.' The fact that the infinitive is of either voice at will ought now to be almost a commonplace. In RV. 10. 108 we have a pertinent example: the *Paṇis* have asked Saramā how she got over the river; she answers: *atiṣkādo bhiyāsā tān na āvat* = 'therefore (the river) helped me in fear of (my) leaping over,' or if we do not supply the notion 'my,' 'in fear of being leapt over.' The secret of the passive lies in an indefinite subject: *vivit* is a definite 'he lives,' *vivitur* an indefinite 'one lives.'

Sanskrit went through all the changes of Latin, but not with root-nouns. *ratnadhā* || ३, e. g., may be explained as **ratnṃ + dhā* 'present-giving,' and in respect of inflection it acts precisely as a gerundive would do; another common word is *vayo-dhā* 'strength-giving.' These are on just the same plane as *sec-undus* 'success-giving, favoring' (cf. L. and Sh., s. v. *sequor*, II, B. 5) and *fāc-undus* 'fluent' (cf. L. and Sh., s. v. *facilis*, I, B. a), which a popular etymology has connected with *fā-ri*.

It is finally claimed for this explanation that it makes clear the form, the syntax, and the shift of meaning from active to passive, and accounts besides for the doublet *ferendus* and *ferundus*.¹

LEXINGTON, VA.

EDWIN W. FAY.

¹A possible case of survival of *-ndae* in infinitive function lies before us in Epid. 74 Puppis pereunda est (BT) probe. Here the texts read *pereundast*. We might read *pereundae st*, but the scribe of B cannot be trusted to represent the original state of things, for though at Ep. 330 he writes *copia st* and at 702 *ea st*, at 60 he writes *sapientia est* for *ia st*.

With the reading *pereundae st* we can explain the active meaning of the gerundive, i. e. infinitive, by translating 'is for perishing.'

The same interpretation is applicable to Trin. 1159 placenda <e> dos quoque st = 'the dower is for pleasing too,' i. e. 'must please.'

We can add an additional specification to Brix's note on this vs.: "es stammt dieser Gebrauch aus einem Zeitalter her, das die Grenzlinie zwischen Verba transitiva und neutra noch nicht scharf gezogen hatte"—yes, we can put this usage in the Aryan period. Cf. RV. 10. 14. 2 *nāigā gāvryutir āpabhartavā u* 'this pasture is not for robbing' for an example in Vedic—in German *nicht zu rauben*. It makes no difference whether *mirabile dictu* be translated 'wonderful to tell' or 'be told.'